

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O Box Ludy Alexandrib, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,985	06/19/2005	Maarten P. Bodlaender	NL021483	2628
24737 7590 07/12/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			PATEL, KAUSHIKKUMAR M	
BRIARCLIFF	BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	
,			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/539,985	BODLAENDER, MAARTEN P.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kaushikkumar Patel	2188				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realized to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2005.						
,	· · · ·					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	,					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers		•				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/19/2005. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/539,985 Page 2

Art Unit: 2188

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on June 19, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification .

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (I) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if

Art Unit: 2188

the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. The sections of specification is not separated by titles of the sections, which are followed by the description of the subject matter, such as "FIELD OF THE INVENTION" followed by the relevant description and then new title, such as "BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION" etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-**19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwols (US 6,839,721) and further in view of Thomas et al. (US 6,529,992).

As per claims 1, 10 and 19 Schwols teaches a method/system for archiving data in a computer to a high-density optical backup disc (Schwols, fig. 1, item 124, col. 2, lines 26-44), comprising:

reading an executable command (col. 5, line 60);

determining data to store to the backup disc responsive to the command (col. 3, lines 35-45; col. 4, lines 8-17; col. 9, lines 24-45);

transferring the data to the backup disc (col. 9, lines 5-10; col. 19, lines 52-55);

Application/Control Number: 10/539,985

Art Unit: 2188

identifying the data transferred to the backup disc (col. 3, lines 37-45; col. 9, lines 24-45).

Schwols teaches backing up data to optical disk but fails to teach reading executable command from backup disc as required by the claims. Thomas teaches a method for automatically executing application upon insertion of removable media (e.g. CD-R, DVD-RAM etc.) (Thomas, abstract, col. 4, lines 53-56, col. 8, lines 18-26). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize method of automatic execution of application, when removable media is inserted into the computer as taught by Thomas in the system of Schwols to provide automatic backup without user intervention and much knowledge of the application (Thomas, col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 5).

As to requirement of claim 10, Thomas teaches readable medium (Thomas, claim 1).

As per claims 2 and 11, Thomas teaches reading disc after insertion of the disc into compatible disc drive (Thomas, col. 6, lines 1-5).

As per claims 3 and 12, Thomas teaches the backup disc is selected from the CD-R and DVD-RAM (Thomas, col. 4, line 55), but fails to teach selecting backup disc from group of DVD-R, DVD-RW and recordable blue-laser DVD, but use of such media as data storage and backup is known in the art and therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select backup disc from group of DVD-R, DVD-RW and recordable blue-laser DVD because DVD provides larger storage capacity than CD-R and DVD-RAM discs.

Art Unit: 2188

As per claims 4 and 13, Schwols teaches determining data to store to the backup disc comprises selecting data for storing that has not been identified as transferred (Schwols, col. 15, line 58 – col. 16, line 16).

As per claims **5**, **6**, 14 and 15, Schwols and Thomas fail to teach backing up only media files or video files as required by the claims but Schwols teaches user can select files that needs to backed up (Schwols, col. 4, lines 5-7, col. 14, lines 60-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to backup media files (claims 4 and 14) and/or video files (claims 5 and 15) according to importance of files.

As per claims and 16, Schwols teaches back up of data files to removable optical storage device (Schwols, abstract), which inherently teaches transferring data to back disc includes writing data to the disc.

As per claims 8, 9, 17 and 18, Schwols teaches prompting user to insert another disc if disc is full (Schwols, col. 16, lines 8-11) and Thomas teaches ejecting the disc (Thomas, col. 9, lines 31-34). Although, Schwols and Thomas combined failed to teach ejecting disc when it is filled as required by the claims. However the combined teaching of Schwols and Thomas teaches automatic execution of (backup) application without user interference and hence when the disc becomes full, the user is unaware of the amount of space in the back disc and thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to eject disc when it becomes full to notify the user to insert new disc (Schwols, col. 16, lines 9-10).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Robinson (US 2003/0050940) teaches automatic backup of data when external storage device is connected to computer.

Liu et al. (US 2004/0054846) teaches auto back to removable storage device. Evers et al. (US 6,542,975) teaches backup to optical storage devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaushikkumar Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5536. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00 am - 4.30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2188

July 5, 2007

Kaushikkumar Patel Examiner Art Unit 2188

SUPPRVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

7/06/07